



**Queensland University of Technology**  
Brisbane Australia

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

[Simpson, Matthew J.](#) & Plank, Michael J  
(2017)

Simplified calculation of diffusivity for a lattice-based random walk with a single obstacle.

*Results in Physics.* (In Press)

This file was downloaded from: <https://eprints.qut.edu.au/110869/>

© **The authors**

CC-BY Licence

**License:** Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0

**Notice:** *Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published source:*

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rinp.2017.08.063>

## Accepted Manuscript


Simplified calculation of diffusivity for a lattice-based random walk with a single obstacle

Matthew J Simpson, Michael J Plank

PII: S2211-3797(17)30792-1  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rinp.2017.08.063>  
Reference: RINP 913

To appear in: *Results in Physics*

Received Date: 9 May 2017  
Revised Date: 11 August 2017  
Accepted Date: 29 August 2017



Please cite this article as: Simpson, M.J., Plank, M.J., Simplified calculation of diffusivity for a lattice-based random walk with a single obstacle, *Results in Physics* (2017), doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rinp.2017.08.063>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

# Simplified calculation of diffusivity for a lattice-based random walk with a single obstacle

Matthew J Simpson<sup>a</sup>, Michael J Plank<sup>b,c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*School of Mathematical Sciences, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia.*

<sup>b</sup>*School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Canterbury, Christchurch 8140, New Zealand.*

<sup>c</sup>*Te Pūnaha Matatini, a New Zealand Centre of Research Excellence, New Zealand.*

## Abstract

Motion of cells in living tissues is hindered by obstacles, which may be stationary or may also move. We present a simplified method to calculate the exact Fickian diffusivity for a tracer particle in a random walk with one obstacle.

**Key words:** random walk, obstacles, diffusivity, mean squared displacement

*In vivo* cell motion involves crowding effects that can be modelled using lattice-based random walks [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Stationary obstacles have a major impact on the transport of tracer particles [6, 7, 8]. Mercier and Slater introduced an exact method to calculate the reduced Fickian diffusivity of a tracer particle on a lattice with stationary obstacles [9, 10]. The method has several applications [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. Here we present a simplified approach for performing these calculations for a single agent and single obstacle, paying particular attention to the differences between the case where the obstacle is stationary from the case where the obstacle is motile.

Consider an unbiased random walk for two agents – a tracer agent and an obstacle with a given motility – on a lattice with periodic boundaries. The agents are initially placed randomly, and agent  $i$  attempts to undergo a nearest neighbour according to an independent Poisson process of rate  $P_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). Motility events that would place an agent on an occupied site are aborted. Simulations (Supplementary Material) are used to record the horizontal component of the tracer agent's squared displacement,  $x^2(t)$ , and the Fickian diffusivity,  $\bar{D}$ , of the tracer can be estimated by examining the long-time behaviour of the mean squared displacement,  $\langle x^2(t) \rangle$  (Supplementary Material). Figure 1(a) shows that  $\bar{D}/D_0 \approx 0.81$  when the obstacle is stationary, and  $\bar{D}/D_0 \approx 0.84$  when the obstacle is motile, where  $D_0$  is the diffusivity in the absence of the obstacle.

We describe the model as a continuous-time Markov process [19, 20]  $\{X(t) \in S : t \geq 0\}$  with  $n = M - 1$  states, where  $M$  is the number of lattice sites. These states correspond to the relative displacement of the tagged agent (agent 1) from the obstacle (agent 2). For example, on a  $3 \times 3$  lattice,  $n = 8$ , as shown in Figure 1(b). Any transition can be achieved by the movement of agent 1 in a particular direction, or by the movement of agent 2 in the opposite direction. The probability  $p_i(t)$  of being in state  $i$  at time  $t$  satisfies  $d\mathbf{p}/dt = \mathbf{p}Q$  [19], where  $\mathbf{p}(t) = (p_1(t), \dots, p_n(t))$ , and  $Q$  is the transition matrix with elements  $q_{ij} = \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} [P(X(t + \delta t) = j | X(t) = i)] / \delta t$  if  $i \neq j$ , and  $q_{ij} = -\sum_{k \neq i} q_{ik}$  if  $i = j$ .

The diffusivity of agent 1,  $D$ , is given by the Nernst-Einstein equation [9, 10],  $D/D_0 = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} (\mu(\epsilon)/\mu_0)$ , where  $\mu(\epsilon)$  is the mobility of agent 1 in the presence of a directional bias of strength  $\epsilon$ , and  $\mu_0 = P_1/2$  is the mobility of agent 1 in the presence of the same bias without obstacles [9, 10]. The Nernst-Einstein equation applies to the diffusivity of agent 1 in the  $x$  and  $y$  directions separately. However, for a square lattice, these diffusivities are equal for our model, so we just deal with the  $x$  direction. A horizontal bias of strength  $\epsilon$  means that agent 1 moves to the right/left with probabilities  $(1 \pm \epsilon)/4$ , and up/down with probability  $1/4$  each. The movement of agent 2 is unbiased.

Transition rates are calculated including a horizontal bias,  $\epsilon$ . If  $i \rightarrow j$  corresponds to agent 1 moving to the right then  $q_{ij} = P_1(1 + \epsilon)/4 + P_2/4$ . If  $i \rightarrow j$  corresponds to agent 1 moving to the left then  $q_{ij} = P_1(1 - \epsilon)/4 + P_2/4$ . If  $i \rightarrow j$  corresponds to agent 1 moving up/down then  $q_{ij} = (P_1 + P_2)/4$ . All other transition rates are zero. By a suitable choice of timescale, we set  $P_1 = 1$ , and  $P_2$  represents the movement rate of agent 2 relative to that of agent 1. An example showing the structure of  $Q$  is given in Supplementary Material.

The mobility is  $\mu(\epsilon) = \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{p}/\epsilon$ , where  $\mathbf{p}$  is the stationary distribution obtained by solving  $\mathbf{p}Q = \mathbf{0}$ , and  $\mathbf{v}$  is a vector




Figure 1: (a) Stochastic simulation data on a  $3 \times 3$  lattice for a tracer agent with a stationary (red,  $P_1 = 1, P_2 = 0$ ) and moving (green,  $P_1 = P_2 = 1$ ) obstacle. (b) State space for the Markov process in the  $3 \times 3$  case showing the  $n = 8$  states and the prohibited state (blue). (c)  $D/D_0$  as a function of the number of lattice sites and  $P_2$ , exact (solid) and stochastic (circles) results. (d)  $D/D_0$  as a function of obstacle density on a  $5 \times 5$  lattice: simulations of moving obstacles with  $P_2 = 1$  (circles), exact method for stationary obstacles, averaged over  $10^5$  random obstacle configurations (red line), and upper bound (black line).

containing the drift velocity in each state. The drift velocity is  $\epsilon/2$  in all states, except the two states in which the agent and obstacle are horizontally adjacent (states 4 and 5 in Figure 1(b)). The drift velocity is  $-(1 - \epsilon)/4$  in state 4 and  $(1 + \epsilon)/4$  in state 5 (Supplementary Material). For arbitrary  $n$ , we denote these as states as  $l$  and  $r$ , for *left* and *right*. We simplify the problem by expressing  $Q$ ,  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  as  $\epsilon$ -independent and  $\epsilon$ -dependent components [11, 13], i.e.  $Q = Q_0 + \epsilon Q_\epsilon$ , leading to  $D/D_0 = 2(\mathbf{v}_\epsilon \cdot \mathbf{p}_0 + \mathbf{v}_0 \cdot \mathbf{p}_\epsilon)$  for agent 1. In the unbiased case, the stationary distribution is uniform,  $\mathbf{p}_0 = (1/n)[1, \dots, 1]$ , and the drift velocity  $\mathbf{v}_0$  is zero for all states, except states  $r$  and  $l$  where  $\mathbf{v}_0$  is  $\pm 1/4$ . The  $\epsilon$ -dependent component  $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon$  is  $1/2$  for all states, except states  $r$  and  $l$  where  $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon$  is  $1/4$  (Supplementary Material). Calculating the two scalar products gives:

$$D/D_0 = (1 - 1/n) + (p_{\epsilon,r} - p_{\epsilon,l})/2, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{p}_\epsilon$  is found by solving the linear system  $\mathbf{p}_\epsilon Q_0 = -\mathbf{p}_0 Q_\epsilon$ . To satisfy the constraint  $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$ , one column of  $Q$  must be replaced by a column of 1's. The two terms in parenthesis on the right in Equation (1) provide a meaningful physical interpretation:  $1 - 1/n$  is the proportion of unoccupied sites. Because agent 1 is biased to the right, agent 1 is more likely to be located to the left of agent 2, hence  $p_{\epsilon,r} < p_{\epsilon,l}$ , and  $1 - 1/n$  is an upper bound for  $D/D_0$ .

Results in Figure 1(c) show  $D/D_0$  for agent 1. For this model  $D/D_0$  increases with  $n$  and  $P_2$ , with good agreement between the exact and stochastic calculations. Figure 1(c) confirms that  $D/D_0$  approaches  $1 - 1/n$ , as  $P_2$  increases. When  $P_2$  is small, the stationary distribution is close to that for a stationary obstacle. In this case, the biased movement

of agent 1 means it is more likely to be located to the left of agent 2 than to the right of agent 2, making the second term in Equation (1) relatively large and negative. However, when  $P_2$  is large, agent 2 moves very frequently. Because the movement of agent 2 is unbiased, its movements act to return the process towards a uniform distribution. Hence, agent 1 is almost equally likely to be located left or right of agent 2, and  $p_{\epsilon,r} \approx p_{\epsilon,l}$ .

While Equation (1) applies for a single obstacle, the upper bound for  $D/D_0$  extends to  $1 - k/n$  in the case of  $k$  obstacles moving on a lattice with  $n + 1$  sites [18]. If there are  $k$  obstacles on a lattice with  $n + 1$  sites,  $1 - k/n$  is an upper bound for  $D/D_0$ . To illustrate, we perform simulations with  $k$  obstacles, all moving at rate  $P_2 = 1$ , on a  $5 \times 5$  lattice. Figure 1(d) shows that  $D/D_0$  for the tagged agent falls between  $D/D_0$  for the same number of stationary obstacles and the upper bound. This is consistent with our observation that  $D/D_0$  increases with  $P_2$ , and approaches  $1 - k/n$  as  $P_2$  is sufficiently large.

In summary, we present a simplified exact method to calculate the Fickian diffusivity of a tagged agent undergoing a random walk in the presence of an obstacle. The simplification relies on formulating the random walk as a Markov process [20] whose state space represents the relative displacement between the agent and obstacle. While it is standard to represent a random walk as a Markov process [20], our approach provides physical insight by re-formulating the approach of Mercier and Slater [9, 10] as a Markov process and taking advantage of the state space simplification when there is a single agent and a single obstacle. In principle, our approach applies to systems with arbitrary many obstacles, but is only tractable for one obstacle. Nevertheless, the structure of Equation (1) provides physical insight into the role of obstacle motility since the exact result interpolates between the case where the obstacle is stationary and the upper bound when the obstacle moves sufficiently fast. Our results relate to previous observations about lattice-free models of Brownian motion [21]. The diffusivity of a tagged agent moving on a lattice increases with the movement rate of the obstacles, which is consistent with results from a lattice-free description [5, 22]. When an infinitesimally small particle diffuses in a lattice-free model, the effect of the obstacles vanishes in the limit where their movement rate becomes arbitrarily large [22]. However, in a lattice-based model, the tagged agent always has a finite size, equal to one lattice spacing. In this case, our results show that obstacles always reduce the tagged agent diffusivity even in the limit  $P_2 \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Acknowledgments:** We appreciate support from the Australian Research Council (DP170100474), and the suggestions from two referees.

## References

- [1] EA Codling, MJ Plank, S Benhamou. J R Soc Interface. 2008; 5: 813834.
- [2] MJ Saxton. Biophys J. 1994; 66: 394-401.
- [3] AJ Ellery, MJ Simpson, SW McCue, RE Baker. J Chem Phys. 2014; 140: 054108.
- [4] A Wedemeier, T Zhang, H Merlitz, C-X Wu, J Langowski. J Chem Phys. 2008; 128: 155101.
- [5] M Bruna, SJ Chapman. J Chem Phys. 2012; 137: 204116.
- [6] H Soula, B Care, G Belson, H Berry. Biophys J. 2013; 105: 2064-2073.
- [7] H Berry, H Chate. Phys Rev E. 2014; 89: 022708.
- [8] S Smith, R Grima. J Chem Phys. 2017; 146: 024105.
- [9] J-F Mercier, GW Slater, HL Guo. J Chem Phys. 1999; 110: 6050-6056.
- [10] J-F Mercier, GW Slater. J Chem Phys. 1999; 110: 6057-6065.
- [11] AJ Ellery, RE Baker, MJ Simpson. Phys Biol. 2015; 12: 066010.
- [12] AJ Ellery, RE Baker, SW McCue, MJ Simpson. Physica A. 2016; 449: 74-84.
- [13] AJ Ellery, RE Baker, MJ Simpson. J Chem Phys. 2016; 144: 171104.
- [14] AJ Ellery, RE Baker, MJ Simpson. Phys Biol. 2016; 13: 05LT02.
- [15] GW Slater, HL Guo. Electrophoresis. 1996; 17: 977-988.
- [16] J Boileau, GW Slater. Electrophoresis. 2001; 22: 673-683.
- [17] MG Gauthier, GW Slater. Electrophoresis. 2003; 24: 441-451.
- [18] C Kingsbury. Masters thesis, <http://web5.uottawa.ca/www5/p2uo/website/Slater-Theses/2008-ChristineKingsbury-MSc.pdf> (August, 2017).
- [19] G Grimmett, D Stirzaker. *Probability and Random Processes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (2001).
- [20] BD Hughes. *Random Walks and Random Environments* Volume 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press (1995).
- [21] Z Hashin, S Shtrikman. J Appl Phys. 1962; 33: 3125-3131.
- [22] M Bruna, SJ Chapman. SIAM J Appl Math. 2015; 75: 1648-1674.